EDITOR'S NOTE

THE FOLLOWING PAGES WERE POOR HARD COPY AT THE TIME OF FILMING. IF AND WHEN A BETTER COPY CAN BE OBTAINED, A NEW FICHE WILL BE ISSUED.

92-802

NO._____

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JUN 18 1992
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM 1992

JAMES O'LEARY

PETITIONER

VS.

THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO ET. AL.

THE CITY OF WEST SACRAMENTO ET. AL.

RESPONDENTS

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

TO

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

JAMES O'LEARY

P. O. BOX 206

BROADRICK, CA.

95605

25 pp

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

THE PLAINTIFF ALEGES THE DEFENDANTS HAVE VIOLATED " BOTH " THE ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE AND THE FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION FIRST AMENDMENT. - 28 U.S.C.A. SECTION 1331

THE HOLY BIBLE, WEBSTER'S AND CASELL'S DICTIONARY DEFINES THE NAME " SACRAMENTO -SACRAMENT " AS ONE AND THE SAME, MEANING - (QUOTE) AS A SIGN OR SYMBOL OF THE GRACE OF " GOD," TO BE ORDAINED BY " JESUS CHRIST " IN " CERTAIN " RELIGIOUS RITES AND ACTS OF CERTAIN CHRISTAIN RELIGIONS. (NOT ALL RELIGIONS) (UNQUOTE)

THE DEFENDANTS BY USEING THE " HOLY SACRED NAME " SACRAMENTO - SACRAMENT ON THIER MUNICIPAL SEALS, IS SHOWING " PREFERENCE " FOR " CHRISTIANY " AND ALL OTHER RELIGIONS THAT USE SACRAMENTO - SACRAMENT IN THIER RELIGIOUS RITES AND BELIEFS. (UNCONSTITUTIONAL ?)

THE PLAINTIFF ALEGES THIS CASE INVOLES A FEDERAL QUESTION OF EXCEPTIONAL INPORTANCE TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND THE PLAINTIFF'S HOLY SACRED RELIGIOUS BELIEFS.(ORDAINED BY JESUS) THE UNITED STATES DRISTRICT COURT ((EASTERN DRISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA) AND THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS (9 TH. CIR.) " OPINION " DRICTLY CONFLICKS WITH A EXISTING " OPINION " OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS ((7 TH.) AND SUBSTANTIALY AFECTS A RULE OF NATIONAL UNIFORMITY. QUOTE SECTARIAN IMAGERY HAS NO PLACE ON " MUNICIPAL SEALS. "
(HARRIS VS. CITY OF ZION AND CITY OF ROLLING MEADOWS, ILL.) 927 F. 2 D. 1401 7 TH. CIR. (1991)
THE DEFENDANTS AS A MUNICIPAL CORPORTTION CAN NEVER BE " ORDAINED " BY THE CATHOLIC ROMAN CHRISTAIN CHURCH OR ANY OTHER RELIGION THAT HOLDS " SACRAMENTO - SACRAMENT IN ITS BELIEFS.
(UNCONSTITUTIONAL ?)

GOVERMENT SHALL NEITHER ENGAGE IN NOR COMPEL ANY RELIGIOUS PRACTICES. (SACRAMENTO - SACRAMENT INFERES RELIGIOUS CHRISTAIN PREFERENCE ?)

FREE EXCISE - THE PLAINTIFF ALEGES THAT THE VERY " COURT ORDER " BY THE HONORABLE LAWRENCE K. KARLTON, (CHIEF JUDGE, U. S. DRISTRICT COURT, EASTERN DRISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA) ON MARCH, 10, 1989, WAS IN AND BY ITSELF A VIOLATION OF " FREE EXERCISE " AGAINST PLAINTIFF AND HIS HOLY SACRED RELIGION. SACRAMENTO - SACRAMENT ?

BY " GODS WILL " THEY ARE ONE AND THE SAME.

BY REQUIREING PLAINTIFF TO POST BOND OF $ 1450 to USE THE NAME (SACRAMENTO- SACRAMENT) IS " UNFAIR " AND GIVES PERFERENCE TO DEFENDANTS?

THE PLAINTIFF ALEGES THAT THE " NAME " OF THE DEFENDANTS, ON THE MUNICIPAL SEALS OF THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO AND THE CITY OF WEST SACRAMENTO, INFERES A UNCONSTITUTIONAL RELIGIOUS SYMBOL.

THEY ARE TRYING TO ESTABLISH RELIGION BY GOVERMENT BY MISLEADING AND INFERENCE.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
1. QUESTION PERSENTED FOR REVIEW	1
2. LIST OF PARTIES	4
3. TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	5
4. JURISDICTION	6
5. STATUTE INVOLED	7
6. STATMENT OF THE CASE	8
7. REASON FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI	12
8. CONCLUSION	13

APPENDIX

PARTIES INVOLVED

THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO -
EACH ENJOINING DEFENDANTS, EACH OF THEM AND THIER AGENTS, SERVANTS, EMPLOYEES, AND ALL PERSONS ACTING UNDER, OR INCONCERT WITH OR FOR THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO.
THE CITY OF WEST SACRAMENTO -
EACH ENJOINING DEFENDANTS, EACH OF THEM, AND THIER AGENTS, SERVANTS, EMPLOYEES, AND ALL PERSONS ACTING UNDER, OR INCONCERT WITH OR FOR THE CITY OF WEST SACRAMENTO.
HONORABLE LAWRENCE K. KARLTON (CHIEF JUDGE)
UNITED STATES DRISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DRISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA.

DEFENDANTS-

JAMES O'LEARY (PLAINTIFF)
DIOS LAIGLESIA DE LAITIES
P. O. BOX 206
BROADRICK, CA. 95605

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES PADGE

HARRIS VS. CITY OF ZION, 927 F. 2D 1401 7 TH. 1991) THE 7 TH. CIR. COURT OF APPEALS RULED - SECTARIAN IMAGERY HAS " NO " PLACE ON MUNICIPAL SEALS. (QUOTE)

HAL ROACH STUDIOUS, INC. VS. RICHARD FEINER & CO. (9 TH. CIR. 1990) 896 F. 2 D 1542, 1555 N. 19 THE COMPAINT IS CONSTRUED IN THE LIGHT MOST FAVORABLE TO THE PLAINTIFF.

LEMON VS. KUTZMAN (1971) 403 U. S. 602, 91 S. CT. 2105 (1) MUST HAVE A SECULAR PURPOSE, (SACRAMENTO -SACRAMENT IS SACRED HOLY RELIGION) (2) MUST NEITHER ADVANCE NOR INHIBIT RELIGION IN ITS PRINCIPAL OR PRIMARY EFFECT, (SACRAMENTO - SACRAMENTO INFERES CHRISTAINY AND " ORDAINED BY JESUS CHRIST. ") (UNCONSTITUTIONAL) (3) MUST NOT FROSTER AN EXCESSIVE ENTANGLEMENT WITH RELIGION. (UNLAWFULL USE OF " HOLY NAME " IS ENTANGLEMENT IN ITS SELF) (UNCONSTITUTIONAL)

JURISDICTION

FEDERAL QUESTION ?

ESTABLISHMENT OF RELIGION CLAUSE OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION BY DEFENDANTS.

FIRST AMENDMENT 28 U.S.C.A. SECTION 1331

FREE EXCISE CLAUSE OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT OF CON ITUTION. THE PLAINTIFF ALEGES THE COURT ORDER OF HONORABLE LAWRENCE K. KARLTON WAS BY AND IN ITSELF A VIOLATION OF THE PLAINTIFFS " FREE EXERCISE OF RELIGION.

THE PLAINTIFF ALEGES THE USE OF THE HOLY SACRED NAME " SACRAMENTO _ SACRAMENT " (ONE AND THE SAME) BY DEFENDANTS IS MISSLEADING (SHOWING) PREFERENCE FOR CHRISTIANY AND TO BE " ORDAINED BY JESUS ") (UNCONSTITUTIONAL)

STATUTE INVOLED

THE PLAINTIFF ALEGES THIS CASE INVOLES A FEDERAL QUESTION OF EXCEPTIONAL IMPORTANCE TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND THE PLAINTIFFS HOLY SACRED RELIGIOUS BELIEFS.

(SACRAMENTO -SACRAMENT ORDAINED BY JESUS)

THE U. S. DRISTRICT COURT (EASTERN CAL.)

THE U. S. COURT OF APPEALS (9 TH. CIR.)

" OPINION " DIRECTLY CONFLICKS WITH AN EXISTING " OPINION " BY THE U. S. COURT OF APPEALS (7 TH. CIR.) AND SUBSTANTIALY AFECTS A RULE OF NATIONAL UNIFORMITY.

HARRIS VS. CITY OF ZION AND ROLLING MEADOWS - 927 F. 2 D 1401 7 TH. CIR. 91

THE 7 TH. CIRCUIT, COURT OF APPEALS RULED-

QUOTE - SECTARIAN IMAGERY HAS NO PLACE ON " MUNICIPAL SEALS." UNQUOTE

FIRST AMENDMENT 28 U.S.C.A. SECTION 1331

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

THE PLAINTIFF ALEGES THE DEFENDANTS COMMITED " CONSPIRACY " TO DEPRIVE PLAINTIFF OF EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS, OR THE GRANTING OF EQUAL PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES UNDER THE LAW, 14 TH. AMENDMENT SECTION 1

THERE IS A CONFLICK BETWEEN TWO FEDERAL COURTS OF APPEALS.

THE NINTH CIRCUIT DISAGREES WITH THE SEVENTH.

(QUOTE) SECTARIAN IMAGERY HAS NO PLACE ON " MUNICIPAL SEALS." (UNQUOTE)

HARRIS VS. CITY OF ZION AND ROLLING MEADOWS, ILL. 927 F. 2 D. 1401 7TH. CIR. 1991

The PLAINTIFF ALEGES THAT THE " NAME " SACRAMENTO - SACRAMENT ON THE SEALS OF THE CITY SACRAMENTO AND WEST SACRAMENTO INFERES A RELIGIOUS SYMBOL. ((CHRISTAIN SYMBOL AND " ORDAINED BY JESUS CHRIST ")

THIS CASE HAS MOVED THROUGH BOTH LOWER COURTS U. S. DRISTRICT COURT (91-925 0 and U. S. COURT OF APPEALS.(91-16288)

THERE HAS BEEN NO RESPECT SHOWN TOWARD THE PLAINTIFF OR HIS CIVIL RIGHTS. 1 ST. AND 14 TH.

DEFENDANT WEST SACRAMENTO NEVER ANSWERED,

REFUSED ANY " DISCOVERY." RULE 250 E. AND D
DEFENDANT CITY OF SACRAMENTO - REFUSED ANY
" DISCOVERY " (RULE 250 E. AND D.) THEN
UNLAWFULLY SIEZED THE " GOOD SHIP SEAMILL "
WITH THE DIOS LAIGLESIA DE LAITIES CHURCH
WITHIN. THEY UNLAWFULLY " BURNED " ARSON ?
THE SHIP (WORLD WAR 2 MINESWEEPER) AND
DISTROYED THE DIOS LAIGLESIA LAITIES CHURCH.
THEY BURNED THE "ALTER AND ALL THE RELIGIOUS
ARTIFACTS " OF THE DIOS LAIGLESIA DE LAITIES.

THEY THEN " COURT ORDERED " THE PLAINTIFF TO
DISTROY HIS CHURCH DIOS LAIGLESIA DE LAITIES
AND HOME LOCATED AT 2531 32SD. ST. NEXT TO THE
ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AT 2533 32 SD, ST.
THERE WAS 5 SUBSTANDARD BUILDINGS, WITH 3 OF
THEN OWENED BY THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. 2 OF THE 3
EXTENDED ONTO THE DIOS LAIGLESIA DE LAITIES
CHURCH PROPERTY. (UNLAWFULLY)
THE CITY ARRESTED THE PLAINTIFF AND HIS 4 SONS.
THEY CHARGED THEM WITH " FELONEY," FOR NOT
" OBEYING THE COURT ORDER " AND NOT DISTROYING
THE DIOS LAIGLESIA DE LAITIES AND HOUSE.
THE CITY " CONDEMED " THE DIOS LAIGLESIA DE
LAITIES CHURCH AND BUILDINGS AND NOT THE ROMAN

CATHOLIC BUILDINGS. (UNCONSTITUTIONAL ?)
THEY HELD A " MOCK " TRIAL, AND WAS FORCED
(GOOD LAWER) TO DISMISS THE CHARGES AGAINST
THE SONS.
THEY THEN PUT THE PLAINTIFF (80 YRS. OLD)
IN " SOLITARY CONFINEMENT " IN THE SACRAMENTO
COUNTY JAIL BY BT FORCE AND DURESS.
THEY THEN " BULLDOZZED " DOWN THE DIOS LAIG-
LESIA DE LAITIES CHURCH AND HOUSE AND GAVE
" UNLAWFULL POSSESSION " TO THE CATHOLIC
CHURCH, WHO THEN FENCED IN IN UNLAWFULLY.
BE FORCE AND DURESS THEY HAVE MADE THE
PLAINTIFF SUFFER ANGER, SHAME, FRIGHT,
HUMILIATION, MENTAL ANGUISH, EMOTIONAL
DIRSTRESS, AND PHYSICAL DISTRESS.
IS ALL THIS IN RETALIATION ?
THE PLAINTIFF RETURNED FROM OVERSEAS TO FIND
THAT THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO WAS IN THE
PROCESS OF SELLING THE ENTIRE " WATERFRONT "
(EAST SIDE) TO THE FOREIGN INVESTORS AND
SHOWING NO RESPECT TOWARD ADMIRALTY OR
ADMIRALTIES. (NO MOORING FOR SHIPS)
THREATHEN TO BURN MY SHIP ?

WHEN THE PLAINTIFF " MOORED " HIS SHIP (GOOD SHIP SEAMILL) IN THE NAVIGABLE WATERS OF THE SACRAMENTO RIVER, HE DID NOT KNOW THAT THE RIVER WAS ABOUT TO BE SOLD " DOWN THE RIVER " TO THE " FOREIGN INVESTORS " BY THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO. HE DID KNOW THAT MONOLITHIC JAPAN INC. THROUGH THIER HOLDING COMPANYS (LIGHTHOUSE MARINA AND RIVERBEND DEVEOLPMENT) HAD ALREADY BOUGHT THE WEST SIDE OF THE RIVER AND HARBOR VIEW CORP. THROUGH RIVERVIEW CORP. (HOLDING CO.) OF SACRAMENTO, WAS TO BUY THE " WATERFRONT " ON THE SACRAMENTO SIDE.

MONOLITHIC " KEIRETSU " (JAPAN TOP HOLDING CO.) KNEW HOW TO " PLAY " ONE SIDE AGAINST THE OTHER. SO THEY PUT THIER FIRST $$$ BILLION DOLLARS ON THE WEST SIDE FOR " BAIT " TO TRAP THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO INTO SELLING THE " WATERFRONT."

THEY FOUND NO PROBLEM IN BUREAUC-RATS TO SELL THIER SOULS IN THE " MARKET PLACE. "

THEY WOULD GIVE MONOLITHIC JAPAN INC. THE WHOLE CITY OF SACRAMENTO FOR A PRICE. (UNCONSTITUT - IONAL)

REASON FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

(A)

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS (9 TH. CIR.) " OPINION " DRICTLY CONFLICKS WITH A EXISTING " OPINION " OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS (7 TH. CIR.) AND SUBSTANTIALY AFECTS A RULE OF NATIONAL UNIFORMITY.

HARRIS VS. CITY OF ZION AND CITY OF ROLLING MEADOWS, ILL. 927 F..2 d. 1401 7TH. CIR.91 !XXX9(1991)

(C)

THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION
FIRST AMENTMENT 28 U.S.C.A. SECTION 1331
the plaintiff aleges THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO AND THE CITY OF WEST SACRAMENTO IS TRYING TO ESTABLISH " GOVERMENT " BY " NAME " AND ACTIONS.

THE UNITED STARES CONSTITUTION
VIOLATION OF FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE BY REQUIREING BOND ($ 1450) FOR EXPRESSION OF RELIGIOUS BLIEFS OF PLAINTIFF.

CONCLUSION

THE PETITIONER JAMES O'LEARY RESPECTFULLY PRAYS THAT A WRIT OF CERTIORARI ISSUE TO REVIEW THE JUDGEMENT AND OPINION OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS.(9 TH. CIR.)

God Bless All
James O'Leary

APPENDIX

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEA

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JAMES O'LEARY, SR.,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

vs.

CITY OF SACRAMENTO, CITY OF WEST SACRAMENTO, a Municipal Corporation,

Defendant-Appellee.

FILED

APR 23 1992

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

No. 91-16288

DC# ~~CV-91-952-WBS~~ 91-925
Eastern California
(Sacramento)

ORDER

BEFOR : FARRIS, O'SCANNLAIN AND TROTT JUDGES

ON MARCH 3, 1992, APPELANT WAS ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE WHY HIS APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURTS DISMISSAL OF HIS COMPLAINT WITHOUT PREJUDICE SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR LACK OF JURISDICTION. IN RESPONCE, APPELLANT HAS FILED A " PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTICRARI " WHICH REQUESTS THAT THIS COURT VACATE THE DISTRICT COURTS MARCH, 10,1989 ORDER WHICH DECLARED APPELLANT AND HIS FAMILY MEMBERS " VEXATIOUS LITIGANTS." THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTORARI " IS CONSTRUED AS A PETITION FOR " WRIT OF MANDAMUS. " SO CONSTRUED, THE PETITION IS DENIED. SEE- BAUMAN VS. U. S. DISTRICT COURT 557 F. 2d 650 (9 TH. CIR. 1977)

THE APPEAL IS DISMISSED FOR LACK OF JURISDICTION. UNITED STATES 704 F. 2d 1099 (9 TH, CIR. 1983)



UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JAMES O'LEARY SR.

PLAINTIFF - APPELLANT

VS.

CITY OF SACRAMENTO, ET. AL

CITY OF WEST SACRAMENTO ET. AL.

DEFENDANTS - APPELLEES

BEFORE : FARRIS, O'SCANNLAIN AND TROTT, JUDGES

APPELLANTS PETITION FOR REHEARING OF THE APRIL 23, 1992 ORDER IS DENIED. APPELLANTS SUGGESTION FOR REHEARING EN BANC OF THE APRIL 23, 1992 ORDER IS DENIED. THE APPEAL IS NOW CLOSED. THE CLERK SHALL ACCEPT NO FURTHER FILINGS IN THIS APPEAL.

FILED

MAY 29 1992

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

No. 91-16288

DC# CV-91-952-WBS
Eastern California
(Sacramento)

ORDER

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JAMES O'LEARY,

PLAINTIFF

VS.

CITY OF SACRAMENTO

CITY OF WEST SACRAMENTO

DEFENDANTS

FILED

JUL 24 1991

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BY: DEPUTY CLERK

BEFOR THIS COURT IS PLAINTIFFS COMPLAINT FILED JULY 15, 1991, ALLEGING THAT THE CITY SEALS OF THE CITIES OF SACRAMENTO AND WEST SACRAMENTO ARE UNCONSTITUTIONAL. AFTER EXAMINING THE COMPLAINT, THE COURT FINDS THAT IT FALLS WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THIS COURTS MARCH 10, 1989, ORDER REQUIRING PLAINTIFF TO POST A BOND ($ 1450) IN ONE THOUSAND, FOUR HUNDRED FIFTY DOLLARS BEFOR FILING ANY DOCUMENTS OR CASES CONCERNING A FIRST AMENDMENT CHALLENGE TO THE NAME " SACRAMENTO - SACRAMENT "

BECAUSE PLAINTIFF HAS FILED COMPLAINT WITHOUT POSTING THE REQUIRED BOND, THE COMPLAINT IS DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO REFILE THE COMPLAINT WITHIN 10 DAYS UPON GIVING SECURITY BY POSTING A BOND IN THE APPROPRIATE AMOUNT. IT IS THEREFOR ORDERED THE PLAINTIFFS COMPLAINT BE, AND THE SAME IS, HEREBY DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE. PLAINTIFF MAY REFILE THE COMPLAINT WITHIN 10 DAYS ONLY UPON POSTING THE REQUORED BOND IN THE AMOUNT OF ONE THOUSAND FOUR HUNDRED FIFTY DOLLARS. ($ 1450) JULY 25/ 91

William B. Shubb

WILLIAM B. SHUBB
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPENDIX

JAMES O'LEARY

P. O. BOX 206

BROADRICK, CA.

95605 PLAINTIFF

VS.

THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO ET. AL.

THE CITY OF WEST SACRAMENTO ET. AL.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS (9 TH. CIR.)

CASE # 91-16288 D. C. # CV. -91-925

U. S. COURT OF APPEALS (9 TH. CIR.)

FILED 4/ 23/ 92 - petition denied -

APPEAL DISMISSED FOR LACK OF JURISDICTION.

U. S. COURT OF APPEALS (9 TH. CIR.)

FILED 5/29/92

PETITION FOR REHEARING DENIED, APPEAL CLOSED.

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS (9 TH. CIR.)

CASE # 91-16288

U.S. DRISTRICT COURT (EASTERN DRISTRICT)

FILED 7/24/91

order to dismiss

God Bless all

James O'Leary

UNITED STATES DRISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DRISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CASE #
CIVS 91- 9

JAMES O'LEARY

PLAINTIFF,

VS.

CITY OF SACRAMENTO,
A MUNICIPAL CORPORATION,

CITY OF WEST SACRAMENTO,
A MUNICIPAL CORPORATION.

" COMPLAINT "
FOR
UNCONSTITUTIO
OF CITY SEALS

Court seals the fate of one town's symbol

BY JEAN PONESSA
GOVERNING MAGAZINE

Religion can be a part of a town's history, community or even its name, but it needs to stay off the city seal.

That's what a federal appeals court ruled when it declared unconstitutional the seals of two northeastern Illinois towns.

"Sectarian religious imagery simply has no place on municipal seals," a 7th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals panel said.

In the case of Zion, Ill., a town of 19,000, the city seal includes a cross and a banner that reads "God Reigns." The seal was used by the religious community that founded the town in the 1860s.

Former Zion Mayor Adeline Geo-Karis, who also is a state senator, says the seal has been used for years without stifling religious diversity. Religion is part of the history of

• See Seals, Page A7

Seals

• From Page

many towns, will happen i pus Christi?"

Zion has reconsideratic Court of Appe

Richard G for residents associated wi ciety of Sep tains that thi only to munici

"A seal is government," man. "You ha a viewer woul sion of endor religion, or re ligion."

The town s ing Meadows unconstitution seal's four qu building with "This comm viewer that th Christianity, v ligions. It com Christians tha ers," says Mr.

But the cit cross does not

v.

CITY OF SAC
municipal c
CITY OF WES
municipal c

D

E

1991, allec

and West S

complaint,

court's Mar

of One Tho

filing any

challenge

filed the

AO82
(Rev. 4/90)

ORIGINAL

RECEIPT FOR PAYMENT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 134272

for the

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

at Sacto

RECEIVED FROM James O'Leary

Fund		ACCOUNT	AMOUNT
885XX	Deposit Funds	604700	14500 00
604700	Registry Funds		
	General and Special Funds		
308800	Immigration Fees		
085000	Attorney Admission Fees		
086900	Filing Fees	TOTAL	14500 00
322340	Sale of Publications		
322350	Copy Fees	Case Number or Other Reference	
322360	Miscellaneous Fees	CV 91-925 WBS	
143500	Interest		
322380	Recoveries of Court Costs		
322386	Restitution to U.S. Government		
121000	Conscience Fund		
129900	Gifts		
504100	Crime Victims Fund		
613300	Unclaimed Monies		
510000	Civil Filing Fee (½)		
510100	Registry Fee		

Checks and drafts are accepted subject to collection and full credit will only be given when the check or draft has been accepted by the financial institution on which it was drawn.

DATE	Cash	Check	M.O.	Credit
July 26 19 91	✓			

DEPUTY CLERK

AO82
(Rev. 4/90)

ORIGINAL

RECEIPT FOR PAYMENT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 134706

for the

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

at S.

RECEIVED FROM JAMES O'LEARY

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
DEC 30 1992
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. 92-802

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1992

JAMES O'LEARY,

Petitioner,

v.

CITY OF SACRAMENTO,

Respondent.

Petition For Writ Of Certiorari To The Supreme Court Of The United States

OPPOSITION TO PETITION FOR CERTIORARI

SHARON SIEDORF CARDENAS
City Attorney
WILLIAM P. CARNAZZO
Assistant City Attorney
LESLIE R. LOPEZ*
Deputy City Attorney
City of Sacramento

921 Tenth Street, Suite 700
Sacramento, CA 95814-2717
Telephone: (916) 264-5346

Attorneys for Respondent, City of Sacramento

**Counsel of Record*

COCKLE LAW BRIEF PRINTING CO., (800) 225-6964
OR CALL COLLECT (402) 342-2831

22 pp

QUESTION PRESENTED

1. Whether the dismissal of a complaint without prejudice should be reviewed by this Court upon a petition for a writ of certiorari.

PARTIES INVOLVED

The only parties to the case at bar are petitioner James O'Leary and respondent City of Sacramento.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

QUESTION PRESENTED i

PARTIES INVOLVED ii

RELEVANT STATUTES 1

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 2

REASONS FOR DENYING CERTIORARI 3

I. THE INSTANT PETITION RAISES NO CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES 3

A. The District Court's Dismissal of Petitioner's Complaint Without Prejudice Is Not An Appealable Order 4

CONCLUSION 8

APPENDIX 1a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

Allen v. Veterans Administration, 749 F.2d 1386 (9th Cir. 1984) 6

Braxton v. United States, ___ U.S. ___, 111 S.Ct. 1854 (1991) 3

Cohen v. Beneficial Industrial Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541 (1949) 5

Eason v. Dickson, 390 F.2d 585 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 392 U.S. 914 (1968) 4

Gerritsen v. de la Madrid Hurtado, 819 F.2d 1511 (9th Cir. 1987) 6

Lauro Lines, s.r.l. v. Chasser, 490 U.S. 495 (1989) 5

McAfee v. Gray, 201 F.2d 109 (9th Cir. 1953) 5

Monti v. Department of Industrial Relations, 582 F.2d 1226 (9th Cir. 1978) 6

Resnick v. La Paz Guest Ranch, 289 F.2d 814 (9th Cir. 1961) 4

Ruby v. Secretary of the United States Navy, 365 F.2d 385 (9th Cir. 1966), cert. denied, 386 U.S. 1011 (1967) 5

Scanlon v. Atascadero State Hosp., 677 F.2d 1271 (9th Cir. 1982), vacated on other grounds, 465 U.S. 1095 (1984) 6

Weingartner v. Union Oil Co. of California, 431 F.2d 26 (9th Cir. 1970), cert. denied, 400 U.S. 1000 (1971) 4

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

Page

STATUTES

28 U.S.C. § 1254 1

28 U.S.C. § 1291 ..... 1, 3, 4

28 U.S.C. § 1292(a) 6

28 U.S.C. § 1292(c) 1

28 U.S.C. § 1295 1

RELEVANT STATUTES

Respondent submits that the following statutes are relevant to the disposition of the instant petition:

28 U.S.C. section 1254:

Cases in the court of appeals may be reviewed by the Supreme Court by the following methods:

(1) By writ of certiorari granted upon the petition of any party to any civil or criminal case, before or after rendition of judgment or decree;

(2) By certification at any time by a court of appeals of any question of law in any civil or criminal case as to which instructions are desired, and upon such certification the Supreme Court may give binding instructions or require the entire record to be sent up for decision of the entire matter in controversy.

28 U.S.C section 1291:

The courts of appeals (other than the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit) shall have jurisdiction of appeals from all final decisions of the district courts of the United States, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, the District Court of Guam, and the District Court of the Virgin Islands, except where direct review may be had in the Supreme Court. The jurisdiction of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit shall be limited to the jurisdiction described in sections 1292(c) and 1295 of this title.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner O'Leary, a pro se litigant, inappropriately requests this Court to review an order whereby the district court dismissed petitioner's complaint without prejudice.

Since March 1989, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California has considered petitioner O'Leary to be a vexatious litigant. 3a, *infra*. This finding was made in light of petitioner O'Leary's filing of "numerous pro se actions in [the district court] over recent years" which, with respect to the City of Sacramento, "constitute[] an abuse of the judicial process." 1a, 2a, *infra*. Upon being found to be a vexatious litigant, petitioner O'Leary was ordered to post a bond in the amount of $1,450 if he wished to file "any documents or cases concerning a First Amendment challenge to the name 'Sacramento.' " 3a, *infra*. Petitioner O'Leary never challenged this order in a timely manner.

In July 1991, petitioner O'Leary filed the instant challenge regarding the use of the name Sacramento, claiming that Sacramento's city seal somehow infringes upon his First Amendment rights. Petitioner O'Leary requests $11,000,000 in damages in addition to injunctive relief barring respondent City of Sacramento from the use of its city seal.

On July 24, 1991 the Honorable William B. Shubb, Judge of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California, determined that petitioner O'Leary's latest challenge to the name Sacramento was within the scope of the court's March 1989 order. 4a, *infra*. Accordingly, Judge Shubb entered an order dismissing petitioner O'Leary's complaint "without prejudice to

refile the complaint within 10 days" upon posting a bond in the appropriate amount. 4a, *infra.*

Although petitioner O'Leary subsequently filed the vexatious litigant bond, he did not refile his complaint. Rather, petitioner O'Leary thereafter embarked upon a series of baseless appeals. 6a, 7a, *infra.* The Ninth Circuit dismissed the appeal for lack of jurisdiction in April 1992. 6a, *infra.* Thereafter, in response to petitioner O'Leary's new series of filings with the Court of Appeals, the Ninth Circuit ordered the appeal closed and directed the Clerk of the court to accept no further filings in the matter. 7a, *infra.*

Respondent City of Sacramento respectfully submits that the district court's July 1991 order is not a final, appealable order. 28 U.S.C. § 1291. Accordingly, the instant petition should be denied.[1]

REASONS FOR DENYING CERTIORARI

I. THE INSTANT PETITION RAISES NO CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES

The principal purpose for which the Court uses certiorari jurisdiction is to resolve conflicts among the Circuit Courts of Appeals and state courts concerning the meaning of provisions of federal law. See, *Braxton v. United States,* ___ U.S. ___, 111 S.Ct. 1854, 1957, 114

[1] This petition was docketed in this Court effective June 18, 1992. Respondent City was not served and did not receive a copy of the petition until December 2, 1992.

L.Ed.2d 385, 391 (1991). As discussed below, petitioner O'Leary did not perfect federal appellate jurisdiction and the instant petition presents no conflict requiring resolution by this Court.

A. THE DISTRICT COURT'S DISMISSAL OF PETITIONER'S COMPLAINT WITHOUT PREJUDICE IS NOT AN APPEALABLE ORDER

It has long been the rule that the dismissal of a complaint which does not dismiss the entire action cannot be appealed. In the instant case, the district court ordered only that petitioner O'Leary's complaint be dismissed without prejudice and, further, granted petitioner O'Leary permission to refile his complaint. 4a, *infra*. Clearly, the district court's order did not dispose of the claims of any party to this action and, therefore, federal appellate jurisdiction has never attached.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. section 1291, the courts of appeal "have jurisdiction of appeals from all final decisions of the district courts of the United States . . . except where a direct review may be had in the Supreme Court." Under section 1291, a final decision is one which, by its own force, terminates the case on the merits as to all the parties and leaves nothing further to be done. See, e.g., *Weingartner v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 431 F.2d 26, 27 (9th Cir. 1970), cert. denied, 400 U.S. 1000 (1971); *Eason v. Dickson*, 390 F.2d 585, 587-88 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 392 U.S. 914 (1968); *Resnick v. La Paz Guest Ranch*, 289 F.2d 814 (9th Cir. 1961). The effect of section 1291 is to disallow appeals from any decision which is tentative, informal or

incomplete. *Cohen v. Beneficial Industrial Loan Corp.*, 337 U.S. 541, 546 (1949).

Thus, so long as the matter remains open, unfinished or inconclusive, there may be no appeal. *Id.*[2]

An order which dismisses a complaint without expressly dismissing the action is not, except under special circumstances, an appealable order. *Ruby v. Secretary of the United States Navy*, 365 F.2d 385, 387 (9th Cir. 1966), cert. denied, 386 U.S. 1011 (1967); *McAfee v. Gray*, 201 F.2d 109 (9th Cir. 1953). In *Ruby*, supra, the plaintiff sought a declaration that he was entitled to a discharge from the Navy. Upon the district court's granting of the defendant's motion to dismiss the complaint, the plaintiff appealed. The Secretary of the Navy then moved to dismiss the appeal on the basis that the district court's order did not dismiss the action and, therefore, was not a final appealable decision. *Id.* As the Ninth Circuit found, the order, which did not expressly dismiss the action, was not appealable. *Id.*

---

[2] The *Cohen* case provides a narrow exception to the final judgment rule for that "small class" of prejudgment orders that finally determine claims of right separable from, and collateral to rights asserted in the action, and that are too important to be denied review and too independent of the cause itself to require that appellate consideration be deferred until the whole case is adjudicated. *Cohen*, supra, 337 U.S. at 546. In order to be within the *Cohen* exception, the order must satisfy at least three conditions: It must conclusively determine the disputed question, resolve an important issue completely separate from the merits of the action, and be effectively unreviewable on appeal from a final judgment. See, *Lauro Lines, s.r.l. v. Chasser*, 490 U.S. 495, 498 (1989). In the instant case, the district court's order of dismissal meets none of these criteria.

It is only where it appears that the district court intends a dismissal to dispose of an action that an order dismissing a complaint may be considered final and appealable. *Gerritsen v. de la Madrid Hurtado,* 819 F.2d 1511, 1514 (9th Cir. 1987). Thus, where the district court refuses leave to amend or finds that an amendment of the complaint cannot save an action, an order dismissing a complaint may be considered an appealable order. See, e.g., *Gerritsen,* supra, 819 F.2d at 1514-15; *Allen v. Veterans Administration,* 749 F.2d 1386, 1388-89 (9th Cir. 1984) (complaint dismissed without leave to amend to add the only proper defendant); *Scanlon v. Atascadero State Hosp.,* 677 F.2d 1271, 1272 (9th Cir. 1982) (dismissal of complaint on the ground that plaintiff's claims were barred), vacated on other grounds, 465 U.S. 1095 (1984).

In the instant case, the district court did not expressly dismiss petitioner O'Leary's action. Rather, the court clearly granted petitioner O'Leary permission to maintain his action by refiling his complaint upon the posting of an appropriate bond. Petitioner O'Leary has never perfected federal appellate jurisdiction because the district court did not dispose of the action.[3]

---

[3] The only other basis by which petitioner O'Leary could have invoked appellate jurisdiction is found in 28 U.S.C. Section 1292(a) (interlocutory decisions). Section 1292 is an exception to the congressionally established policy against piecemeal appeals and is a narrow exception "keyed to the need to permit litigants to effectually challenge interlocutory orders of serious, perhaps irreparable, consequence." *Monti v. Department of Industrial Relations,* 582 F.2d 1226, 1228 (9th Cir. 1978). Clearly, petitioner O'Leary did not establish the requirements for review pursuant to section 1292. Respondent City of Sacramento is aware of no authority by which an order such as that presented

In this appeal, petitioner O'Leary can establish no basis for appellate jurisdiction. It therefore follows that the instant petition should be denied. Petitioner's brief in support of this petition claims no error by either the district court or the Court of Appeals. Moreover, petitioner has waived any claim of error since petitioner has subsequently paid the vexatious litigant bond. By paying the bond, petitioner O'Leary has voluntarily complied with the district court's condition to refile his complaint.

The instant petition is not a situation of a pro se appellant proceeding in good faith to avail himself of the protection of the law. Rather, petitioner O'Leary, a vexatious litigant, is simply pursuing his baseless harassment of the City of Sacramento at the expense of the federal court system's resources.

---

here has ever been considered as an appealable interlocutory order.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed herein it is respectfully submitted that the Court should deny the petition for a writ of certiorari.

DATED: December 30, 1992

Respectfully submitted,

SHARON SIEDORF CARDENAS
City Attorney
City of Sacramento

WILLIAM P. CARNAZZO
Assistant City Attorney

LESLIE R. LOPEZ,
Deputy City Attorney

Attorneys for Respondent,
City of Sacramento

**Counsel of Record*

APPENDIX

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE:	NO. CIV.
JAMES O'LEARY, FLORENCE	S-85-998 RAR
O'LEARY, GERALDINE O'LEARY,	NO. CIV.
JAMES O'LEARY, JR., RICHARD	S-86-0092 EJG
O'LEARY, RONALD O'LEARY,	NO. CIV.
individually, and also known as	S-87-328-EJG
DIOS LAIGLESIA DE LAITIES DE	NO. CIV.
HOLY SACRAMENTO EN DIOS	S-87-1510 EJG
	NO. CIV.
	S-88-159 EJG
	NO. CIV.
	S-88-190 LKK
	NO. CIV.
	S-88-793 LKK
	NO. CIV.
	S-88-1019 MLS
	NO. CIV.
	S-88-1139 LKK
	NO. CIV.
	S-89-0043 LKK

ORDER DECLARING PLAINTIFFS TO BE VEXATIOUS LITIGANTS AND REQUIRING BOND

The O'LEARY family has filed numerous pro se actions in this court over recent years. Their complaints generally concern two areas. First, interference with property rights, including evictions and frustrated efforts to inhabit various boats on the Sacramento River (*see* Case Nos. Civ. S-88-793 LKK and Civ. S-88-1139 LKK).

Second, constitutional challenges to the City of Sacramento's use of a name alleged to have religious significance (*see* Case Nos. Civ. S-86-0092 EJG, Civ. S-87-328 EJG, Civ. S-87-1510 EJG, and Civ. S-89-0043 LKK).

Cases in the second category have been routinely dismissed for pleading deficiencies, particularly for failure to adequately allege federal jurisdiction. Plaintiffs' repeated efforts to relitigate this faulty claims constitutes an abuse of judicial process.

This court has adopted the statutory provisions of the California Code of Civil Procedure relating to vexatious litigants, for purposes of requiring security in civil cases. Local Rule 233(b). If the court finds that a party is a vexatious litigant, the court may, on its own motion and at any time, require the vexatious party to give security, bond or undertaking in such amount as the court determines to be appropriate.

Under California law, the term "vexatious litigant" includes:

> [A]ny person . . . [w]ho, after a litigation has been finally determined against the person, repeatedly relitigates or attempts to relitigate, in propria persona, either (i) the validity of the determination against the same defendant or defendants as to whom the litigation was finally determined or (ii) the cause of action, claim, controversy, or any of the issues of fact or law, determined or concluded by the final determination against the same defendant or defendants as to whom the litigation was finally litigated.

California Code of Civil Procedure section 391(b)(2).

The court finds that the complaint concerning the name "Sacramento" filed by plaintiffs constitutes an attempt to relitigate the validity of the court's final determinations in prior cases. Accordingly, the court holds that as far as that subject matter is concerned, plaintiffs are vexatious litigants and makes the following order:

Before filing any documents or cases concerning a First Amendment challenge to the name "Sacramento," any of the above-mentioned plaintiffs shall give security by posting a bond in the amount of One Thousand Four Hundred Fifty Dollars ($1,450), to be used for payment of such costs and damages as may be incurred or suffered by any party as a result of further documents presented to the court by plaintiffs.

Plaintiffs are warned that further actions on their part reflecting disrespect for the court's process and orders may constitute contempt. The court will not hesitate to act as necessary to compel obedience to its orders and to vindicate its authority.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: March 10, 1989.

/s/ Lawrence K. Karlton
LAWRENCE K. KARLTON,
CHIEF JUDGE
UNITED STATES
DISTRICT COURT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JAMES O'LEARY,

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF SACRAMENTO, a municipal corporation, and CITY OF WEST SACRAMENTO, a municipal corporation

Defendant.

NO. CIV. S-91-925 WBS/ JFM

ORDER

(Filed July 24, 1991)

Before the court is plaintiff's complaint filed July 15, 1991, alleging that the "City Seals" of the Cities of Sacramento and West Sacramento are unconstitutional. After examining the complaint, the court finds that it falls within the scope of this court's March 10, 1989, order requiring plaintiff to post a bond of One Thousand Four Hundred Fifty Dollars ($1,450) "[b]efore filing any documents or cases, concerning a First Amendment challenge to the name "Sacramento. . . . " Because plaintiff has filed the complaint without posting the required bond, the complaint is dismissed without prejudice to refile the complaint within 10 days upon giving security by posting a bond in the appropriate amount.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiff's complaint be, and the same is, hereby dismissed without prejudice. Plaintiff may refile the complaint within 10 days only upon posting the required bond in the amount of One Thousand Four Hundred Fifty Dollars ($1,450).

DATED: July 25, 1991

/s/ William B. Shubb
WILLIAM B. SHUBB
UNITED STATES
DISTRICT JUDGE

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JAMES O'LEARY, SR., Plaintiff-Appellant, vs. CITY OF SACRAMENTO, CITY OF WEST SACRAMENTO, a Municipal Corporation, Defendant-Appellee.	No. 91-16288 DC# CV-91-925-WBS Eastern California (Sacramento) ORDER (Filed April 23, 1992)

Before: FARRIS, O'SCANNLIAN and TROTT, Circuit Judges

On March 3, 1992, appellant was ordered to show cause why his appeal from the district court's dismissal of his complaint without prejudice should not be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. In response, appellant has filed a "petition for writ of certiorari" which requests that this court vacate the district court's March 10, 1989 order which declared appellant and his family members to be vexatious litigants. The "petition for a writ of certiorari" is construed as a petition for writ of mandamus. So construed, the petition is denied. *See Bauman v. United States District Court*, 557 F.2d 650 (9th Cir. 1977).

The appeal is dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. *See Proud v. United States*, 704 F.2d 1099 (9th Cir. 1983).

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JAMES O'LEARY, SR., Plaintiff-Appellant, vs. CITY OF SACRAMENTO, et al. Defendants-Appellees.	)	No. 91-16288 DC# CV-91-925-WBS Eastern California (Sacramento) ORDER (Filed May 29 1992)

Before: FARRIS, O'SCANNLAIN and TROTT, Circuit Judges

Appellant's petition for rehearing of the April 23, 1992 order is denied. Appellant's suggestion for rehearing en banc of the April 23, 1992 order is denied. The appeal is now closed. The Clerk shall accept no further filings in this appeal.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

NO. 91-16288
CT/AG#: 91-925

JAMES O'LEARY, SR.

Plaintiff – Appellant

v.

CITY OF SACRAMENTO, CITY OF WEST SACRAMENTO, a Municipal Corporation

Defendant – Appellee

(Filed Jun 10 1992)

APPEAL FROM the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California (Sacramento).

ON CONSIDERATION WHEREOF, It is now here ordered and adjudged by this Court, that the appeal in this cause be, and hereby is dismissed.

Filed and entered April 23, 1992.